

Interview Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	08/844,051	KAO ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Thuan D. Dang	1764	

All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel):

- (1) Thuan D. Dang. (3) _____
 (2) Linda Kubena. (4) _____

Date of Interview: 15 May 2003.

Type: a) ☐ Telephonic b) ☐ Video Conference
 c) ☐ Personal [copy given to: 1) ☐ applicant 2) ☒ applicant's representative]

Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: d) ☐ Yes e) ☒ No.
 If Yes, brief description: _____.

Claim(s) discussed: 4.

Identification of prior art discussed: Suggist (3,789,123).

Agreement with respect to the claims f) ☐ was reached. g) ☒ was not reached. h) ☐ N/A.

Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: applicants suggest removing the word "essentially" from claim 4 to overcome the prior art rejection. The examiner agrees that Suggist's catalyst requires the presence of the sulfided hydrogenation metal. However, a new search would be required once such an amendment is submitted after final rejection. An amendment after final would not be entered.

(A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments that would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.)

THE FORMAL WRITTEN REPLY TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP Section 713.04). If a reply to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN ONE MONTH FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. See Summary of Record of Interview requirements on reverse side or on attached sheet.

Examiner Note: You must sign this form unless it is an Attachment to a signed Office action.

 Examiner's signature, if required